```
1
                  UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2
                NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 3
     SURGICAL INSTRUMENT SERVICE
 4
                                       )
     COMPANY, INC.,
                                       )
 5
                                       )
              Plaintiff,
 6
                                       ) Case No.
              vs.
 7
                                       ) 3:21-CV-03496-VC
     INTUITIVE SURGICAL, INC.,
 8
              Defendant.
 9
10
11
12
            VIRTUAL VIDEOCONFERENCE VIDEO-RECORDED
1.3
                    DEPOSITION OF GREG POSDAL
14
         30(B)(6), SURGICAL INSTRUMENT SERVICE COMPANY
15
16
                    Tuesday, November 1, 2022
17
           Remotely Testifying from Phoenix, Arizona
18
19
20
21
22
     Stenographically Reported By:
23
     Hanna Kim, CLR, CSR No. 13083
24
25
     Job No. 5541334-A
                                                   Page 1
```

```
1
                 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2
                NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 3
     SURGICAL INSTRUMENT SERVICE
 4
                                       )
     COMPANY, INC.,
                                       )
 5
                                       )
              Plaintiff,
6
                                       ) Case No.
              vs.
 7
                                       ) 3:21-CV-03496-VC
     INTUITIVE SURGICAL, INC.,
8
              Defendant.
9
10
11
12
               Virtual videoconference video-recorded
     deposition of GREG POSDAL, in the capacity of a
13
     30(B)(6) witness of Surgical Instrument Service
14
15
     Company, Remotely Testifying from Phoenix, Arizona,
     on Tuesday, November 1, 2022, beginning at
16
17
     9:01 a.m., PDT, and concluding at 10:52 a.m.,
     pursuant to the stipulations of counsel thereof,
18
19
     before Hanna Kim, CLR, Certified Shorthand Reporter,
20
     No. 13083.
21
22
23
2.4
25
                                                    Page 2
```

1	DEMORE MIDEOCONEEDENCE ADDEADANCES OF COUNCEL!
1 2	REMOTE VIDEOCONFERENCE APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:
3	For Plaintiff and the Witness:
4	HALEY GUILIANO
5	BY: RICHARD T. McCAULLEY, ESQ.
6	111 North Market Street, Suite 900
7	San Jose, California 95113
8	669.213.1071
9	richard.mccaulley@hglaw.com
10	
11	For Hospital Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class:
12	BONI, ZACK & SNYDER LLC
13	BY: JOSHUA D. SNYDER, ESQ.
14	15 St. Asaphs Road
15	Bala Cynwyd, Pennsylvania 19004
16	610.822.0203
17	jsnyder@bonizack.com
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	Page 3

1	REMOTE APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:
2	
3	For Defendant Intuitive Surgical:
4	COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
5	BY: ISAAC D. CHAPUT, ESQ.
6	BY: AUSTIN MARTIN, ESQ.
7	Salesforce Tower
8	415 Mission Street, Suite 5400
9	San Francisco, California 94105-2533
10	415.591.7020
11	ichaput@cov.com
12	amartin@cov.com
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	Page 4
	rage 4

1	sterile processing, there's another set of eyes on
2	it to make sure that it appears to be safe for work.
3	At that time, they're pulled out.
4	With the Intuitive instruments, there's a
5	forced inspection at ten. And we were willing to 09:48:01
6	abide by that same inspection process.
7	Q. Do you believe there would have been a
8	regulatory issue with adding 19 lives to an
9	instrument as opposed to just adding ten?
10	MR. SNYDER: Objection to form. 09:48:24
11	THE WITNESS: No.
12	BY MR. CHAPUT:
13	Q. Why not?
14	A. Well, Intuitive's own 510(k) submission
15	called this item substantially equivalent to 09:48:40
16	predicate devices, and those are the devices that
17	we've repaired for decades.
18	Q. Why does that mean that there's no
19	regulatory issue with adding 19 lives to an
20	instrument as opposed to the ten that it's initially 09:49:01
21	set for?
22	A. There are
23	MR. SNYDER: Objection to form.
24	THE WITNESS: There are no regulations for
25	that. The FDA stayed out of repair. They don't 09:49:09
	Page 44

```
1
     we've had -- it has not been a necessity to deal
2
     with any regulatory issues with re- -- regarding the
3
     repair of surgical instrumentation.
     BY MR. CHAPUT:
               So I -- I think implicit in what you just 09:49:25
5
6
     said is that SIS has determined that its reset
7
     process is a repair; is that correct?
               MR. McCAULLEY: Objection to form.
8
9
               THE WITNESS: The -- the reset process
     is -- we've used repair as kind of an umbrella term. 09:49:39
10
     That could be resetting the chip, could be repairing
11
12
     an instrument. So I don't -- I don't know if that
13
     answers your question specifically. But simply
14
     evaluating the instrument and resetting the chip
     wouldn't technically be a repair. No repair was
                                                       09:50:03
15
16
     done. The chip was reset. So it would depend on
17
     the condition and what services were performed.
     BY MR. CHAPUT:
18
19
               Okay. I'm just -- I'm just trying to
     reconcile these questions because initially you said 09:50:27
20
     there's -- there's no problem because the FDA has
21
22
     stayed out of repair, but you also just said that if
23
     there's a chip reset without anything else done,
24
     that that doesn't count as repair. So I -- I'm --
     what I'm trying to understand is, how did SIS come
25
                                                           09:50:44
                                                           Page 45
```